

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virguna 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR Wilson Burgess	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO. 7597	
10/024,043		12/21/2001		CI-0013		
34610	7590	05/20/2003				
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153				EXAMINER		
				AFREMOVA, VERA		
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1651	A	
				DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No.
10/024,043

Applicant(s)

Burgess et al.

Office Action Summary Examiner

Vera Afremova

Art Unit 1651



	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sh	eet with	the correspondence address
Period	for Reply			
	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	TO EXPIRE	1	MONTH(S) FROM
mailin	sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 136 (a). In g date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within t			
- Failure - Any ri	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply by to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause to apply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1 704(b)	the application to beco	me ABANî	DONED (35 U S C § 133)
Status				
1) X	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 26, 2	2003		
2a)	This action is FINAL . $2b)X$ This ac	tion is non-final		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex pa</i>	•		•
Disposi	tion of Claims			
4) X	Claim(s) <u>1-104</u>			is/are pending in the application.
•	4a) Of the above, claim(s) <u>1, 4, 54-63, 76-78, 89, 9</u>	92-101, 103, ar	nd 104	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5).	Claim(s)			is/are allowed.
6)	Claim(s)			is/are rejected.
	Claim(s)			
	Claims 2, 3, 5-53, 64-75, 79-88, 90, 91, and 102			
	ation Papers			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10).	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	e a) accepte	d or b	objected to by the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the o			
11) 🗀	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is:	a)	approved b) disapproved by the Examiner
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	to this Office ac	tion.	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	niner.		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	•		. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a).	All b) Some* c) None of:			
	1 Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been receive	d.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have	ve been receive	d in Ap	plication No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority d application from the International Bure	eau (PCT Rule 1	7.2(a)}	
*S	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th	ne certified copi	es not i	received.
14)_	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under	35 U.S	.C. § 119(e).
a)	The translation of the foreign language provisions	al application ha	as been	received.
15)	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under	35 U.S	.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.
Attachm				
	otice of References Cited (PTC-892)			O-413; Paper Notsi
	otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		ormal Pate	nt Application (PTO-152)
3i inf	formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449, Paper Nois:	6) Other		

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/024,043

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' election with traverse of the Group II (claims 2 and 3 and claims 5-53, 64-75, 79-88, 90, 91 and 102 as depending on claims 2 and/or 3) in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the Group II (claims 2 and 3) and the Group III (claim 4) are classified in the same class and, thus, they should be examined together. This is not found persuasive because classification of subject matter is merely one indication of the burdensome nature of the search involved. The literature search, particularly relevant in this art, is not coextensive and is much more important in evaluating the burden of search. Burden in examining materially different groups having materially different issues also exists.

The elected claims of the Group II (2, 3, 5-53, 64-75, 79-88, 90, 91 and 102) are subject to the election of species requirement.

Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention drawn to different stabilizing processes and this application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention drawn to different types of radiation which are used to sterilize heart valves sensitive to radiation.

1. The species as drawn to the different stabilizing processes are the processes (a) through (f) as indicated in claims 2 or 3, for example: stabilizing process (a) by adding one stabilizer to protect heart valves from radiation (claims 29-38); stabilizing process (b) by reducing the residual solvent content to protect heart valves from radiation (claims 5, 19-26, 66-75, 79, 80, 90,

Application/Control Number: 10/024,043 Page 3

Art Unit: 1651

91, 102); stabilizing process (2) by reducing temperature to protect heart valves from radiation (claims 49-53 and 81); stabilizing process (d) by reducing oxygen content to protect heart valves from radiation (claims 15-18); stabilizing process (e) by adjusting pH to protect heart valves from radiation (claims 2 and 3); stabilizing process (f) by adding one non-aqueous solvent to protect heart valves from radiation (claims 64 and 65).

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species drawn to a stabilizing process for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 2, 3, 27, 28 and 82-88 are generic.

Please, note that the phrases "the residual solvent" (claim 2, line 7; claim 3, line 6) lack antecedent basis.

2. The species as drawn to the different types of radiation are electromagnetic radiations and corpuscular radiations, for example: gamma radiation (claim 41), E-beam radiation (claim 42), visible light radiation (claim 43), ultraviolet (claims 44), x-ray radiation (claim 45), polychromatic visible light (claim 46), infrared radiation (claim 47), combination of visible and ultraviolet light (claim 48), .

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species dawn to one type of radiation for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 2 and 3 are generic. Claims 39 and 40 will be examined as drawn to the elected type of radiation of the claims 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47

Application/Control Number: 10/024,043 Page 4

Art Unit: 1651

or 48. With respect to the claims 6-14, which might be considered generic, it is uncertain whether they are intended for gamma radiation or for the other claimed type of radiation. Please, indicate for what types of radiation the claimed amounts are intended.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species (stabilizing process and radiation type) that are elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/024,043 Page 5

Art Unit: 1651

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vera Afremova whose telephone number is (703) 308-9351. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 9:00 to 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn, can be reached on (703) 308-4743. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Vera Afremova

Art Unit 1651

VERA AFREMOVA

May 12, 2003.

PATENT EXAMINER

Supervisory Patent Examine-Technology Center 1600